

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,179	01/15/2002	Kenneth L. Stanwood	112174-010UTL	2846
30868 7550 07/29/2908 KRAMER & AMADO, P.C. 1725 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			SEFCHECK, GREGORY B	
SUITE 240 ALEXANDRI	A. VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2619	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

 Application No.
 Applicant(s)

 10/053,179
 STANWOOD ET AL.

 Examiner
 Art Unit

 GREGORY B. SEFCHECK
 2619

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) GREGORY B. SEFCHECK, Examiner of Record.	(3) Curt Dodd and Mike McCartney, Applicants.				
(2) Terry Kramer, Applicant's Representative.	(4) Scott Pojunas, Applicant's Representative.				
Date of Interview: 24 July 2008.					
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☑ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant	2)⊠ applicant's representative]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) <u></u> No.				
Claim(s) discussed: 51-75, as proposed to be amended.					
Identification of prior art discussed: Sengodan (US6918034) and Koodli (US6608841).					
Agreement with respect to the claims f) $\hfill \square$ was reached. g) $\hfill \square$ was not reached. h) $\hfill \square$ N/A.					
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion of the differences between the present & proposed claims with the prior art of record was had. Clarifying amendments weree discussed that would overcome the art of record. Applicant's indicated intent to file a submission proposing such amendments in due course.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims					
allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)					
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the	ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE le last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS				

GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview

/Gregory B Sefcheck/ Examiner, Art Unit 2619

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an 

Examiner's signature, if required

requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.